



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/336,200	06/18/1999	SIMON H. CORSTON-OLIVER	M61.12-0099	7359

7590 05/08/2002

JOSEPH R KELLY
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY P A
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 554023319

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 05/08/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

cd

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/336,200

Applicant(s)

Corston-Oliver

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2175



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Mar 27, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35, 41-43, and 62-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35, 41-43, and 62-66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 02
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other:

DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Response to Restriction Requirement has been reviewed. Applicant elects to prosecute claims 1-35, 41-43, and 62-66 of the present application without traverse.
2. Claims 1-35, 41-43, and 62-66 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102(b)

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 12-13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by **Turtle** US patent no. 5,265,065.

As to claim 1, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:

obtaining a set of relations [50, 50 of fig. 4; col. 7, lines 22-27];

identifying constituents in the first textual input that have the relations [50, 40, 42 of fig. 4; col. 8, lines 20-38; ab]; and

determining the relationship between the first and second textual inputs [44, 58 of fig. 4] based on the constituents identified [col. 11, lines 27-42; matching representation nodes of a document network, ab].

As to claim 2, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the relationship between the first and second textual inputs based on the relations [col. 11, lines 43-58; col. 12, lines 59-68].

As to claim 3, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining a hierarchy of grammatical relations [40 of fig. 4]; and obtaining a hierarchy threshold based on a usefulness of grammatical relations in the hierarchy in determining the relationship between the first and second textual inputs [see example, 44 of fig. 4].

As to claim 4, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the usefulness of identified constituents by locating the grammatical relations associated with the identified constituents in the hierarchy [40 of fig. 4].

As to claim 5, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches identifying low ranked constituents having corresponding grammatical relations located in the hierarchy below the hierarchy threshold [stop words removed, col. 10, lines 40-56].

As to claim 6, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the relationship based on constituents in the first textual input, other than the low ranked constituents [col. 9, lines 20-39].

As to claim 7, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches identifying high ranked constituents having a corresponding grammatical relation located in the hierarchy at least as high as the hierarchy threshold [col. 9, lines 57 to col. 10, lines 22]; and annotating the high-ranked constituents with a weighting value which weights the highranked constituents higher than low-ranked constituents [col. 10, lines 12-32].

As to claim 8, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches annotating the high-ranked and low-ranked constituents with fine values based on a location of grammatical relations corresponding to each of the constituents in the hierarchy, the fine values being indicative of relative usefulness of the constituents in determining the relationship [col. 9, lines 57 to col. 10, lines 44; 40 of fig. 4].

As to claim 9, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the relationship based on the fine values associated with constituents [col. 9, lines 67 to col. 10, lines 22].

As to claim 10, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches preferentially matching terms in the first textual input against higher constituents in the second textual input having corresponding grammatical relations located relatively higher on the hierarchy than grammatical relations corresponding to lower constituents [col. 10, lines 12-32].

As to claim 11, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining an index having entries corresponding to the document, the entries corresponding to only the higher constituents as opposed to the lower constituents [col. 10, lines 12-32]; and matching search terms in the query against the entries in the index [col. 15, lines 55-60].

As to claim 12, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining an index having entries corresponding to the document, the entries corresponding to the higher constituents having higher weighting values associated therewith and the entries corresponding to the lower constituents having lower weighting values associated therewith [col. 15, lines 46-66]; and matching search terms in the query against the entries in the index based on the higher and lower weighting values [fig. 6A; col. 13, lines 50 to col. 14, lines 66].

As to claim 13, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining a hierarchy of case information; and obtaining a hierarchy threshold based on the usefulness of a constituent having that case [col. 15, lines 1-17].

As to claim 14, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the usefulness of the identified constituents by locating the case information associated with the identified constituents in the hierarchy [40 of fig. 4].

As to claim 15, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches identifying low ranked constituents having the case indicated by the case information [col. 15, lines 1-17].

As to claim 16, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the relationship based on constituents in the first textual input, other than the low ranked constituents [col. 17, lines 1-44].

As to claim 17, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches identifying high ranked constituents having corresponding case information located in the hierarchy at least as high as the hierarchy threshold [col. 9, lines 57 to col. 10, lines 22]; and annotating the lower ranked constituents with a weighting value which weights the low ranked constituents lower than the high ranked constituents [col. 10, lines 12-32].

As to claim 18, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches annotating the low ranked and high ranked constituents with fine values based on a location of the case information associated with each of the low ranked and high ranked constituents in the hierarchy,

the fine values being indicative of relative usefulness of the constituents [col. 9, lines 57 to col. 10, lines 44; 40 of fig. 4].

As to claim 19, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches determining the relationship based on the fine values associated with the constituents [col. 9, lines 67 to col. 10, lines 22].

As to claim 20, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches preferentially matching terms in the first textual input against higher ranked constituents in the second textual input having corresponding grammatical relations located relatively higher on the hierarchy than grammatical relations corresponding to lower constituents [col. 15, lines 1-66].

As to claim 21, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining an index having entries corresponding to the document, the entries corresponding to only the higher ranked constituents as opposed to the lower ranked constituents [col. 15, lines 1-17]; and matching the search terms in the query against the entries in the index [col 15, lines 1-66].

As to claim 22, Turtle teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Turtle further teaches obtaining an index having entries corresponding to the document, the entries corresponding to the higher ranked constituents having higher weighting values associated therewith and the entries corresponding to the lower ranked constituents having lower weighting values associated therewith;

and matching the search terms in the query against the entries in the index based on the higher and lower weighting values [col. 15, lines 1-66].

5. The elements of claims 23-35, 41-43, and 62-66 are rejected in the analysis above in claims 1-22, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

6. Further references of interest are cited on Form PTO-892 which is an attachment to this office action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is (703) 305-1091. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at (703) 305-3830.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238	(After Final Communication)
(703) 746-7239	(Official Communication)
(703) 746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)

and/or:

(703) 746-5616 (*Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions*).

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

8. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label


"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



Thuy Pardo
April 15, 2002



DIANE D. MIZRAHI
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100